SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VIII, No. 16 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | October 1, 1978

Congressional Scorecard on Carter's R&D Plans

How has Congress treated research budgets in the face of President Carter's urgings (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 14) for unique generosity toward this particular category of government activity?

With the new fiscal year — 1979 — commencing today, the Congressional scorecard indicates that R&D didn't fare too badly; nonetheless, the legislators fell far short of adopting the presidential view that spending for research should be exempted from the budget-paring mood that now envelops Washington. In sum, most budgets are up, but not as much as Mr. Carter requested, and when the recent inflationary surge is calculated in, the final reckoning falls short of the Administration's plan to provide basic research with a purchasing-power increase of around five per cent.

In recent months, as Congress was moving toward final verdicts on the budget that the Administration presented in January, the White House warned that "even relatively small reductions" in the budgets for such agencies as the National Science Foundation, NASA, Agriculture, Defense, and Energy would defeat the Administration's efforts to strengthen the "Nation's capacity and productivity in critical" areas of research.

OTA Issues List of "Priority" Problems---Page 4

With primary elections and the public's opposition to rising taxes in the forefront of their minds, however, lawmakers largely chose to ignore the White House admonitions. In the National Science Foundation's budget for research and related activities, for example, conferees from the House and Senate recommended that Congress cut $23.4 million from the Carter Administration's $850.4 million request. The compromise figure — which both chambers were expected to approve last week — is well above the $806.4 million voted earlier this summer by the House. To the disappointment of many science advocates, however, the final figure fell short of the $863.4 million passed by the Senate.

The NSF appropriation is contained in a $67.9 billion measure for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and various independent agencies, including NASA, which also took a bit of a beating.

Thus, the space agency felt the effects of the budget-cutting fever when the conferees recommended $3.29 billion for all of its research and development activities. The conference recommendation was $14.4 million below the one that had been requested by President Carter last January and approved by the House earlier this summer. The final figure was, however, considerably above the Senate proposal, which would have slashed some $17 million from the Administration's request.

As for the so-called mission agencies, here, too, the legislators have been applying their tax-cutting scalpels in recent months. In some cases, the lawmakers pared spending allowances for scientific research well below the projected rate of inflation, which government officials estimate could run as high as 7 per cent in the next fiscal year.

House-Senate conferees voted last week, for example, $15 million for competitive grants in the Department of Agriculture, compared to President's request of $30 million. For research, development, testing, and evaluation in the Department of Defense, the House voted $12.2 billion. That figure, which was still awaiting Senate approval last week, was $300 million less than the

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

NIH Deputy Director Hans Stetten, chief of the intramural research program at the Bethesda, Md., campus, has asked to be relieved of the post because of poor health.

Joining the move to Washington, which is getting to be something of a stampede as various organizations seek to be closer to the federal agencies that affect their fate: The New Jersey-based American Federation of Information Processing Societies, composed of 14 nonprofit national societies and associations, with total membership of over 100,000.

The Food and Drug Administration has rid itself of a problem that was sure to set off a public battle on the scale of the saccharin controversy — a proposal to double the iron in enriched flour and white bread. FDA, which has twice recommended the iron increase, now says that relatively few Americans are iron-deficient and that evidence is lacking that they would be helped by the proposed iron enrichment.

The Board of Directors of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers has approved a resolution urging government and industry to pay engineers more than their supporting personnel.

. . . R&D Budget and "Thoughtless Stinginess"

(Continued From Page 1)

Administration wanted.

Only the National Institutes of Health managed to fare reasonably well in this year's budget, with the full House approving $2.95 billion and the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommending $3 billion. President Carter had requested $2.65 billion for the health agencies.

The "thoughtless stinginess" that one Administration official said had occurred in most areas, however, seemed to come remarkably easy to the majority of lawmakers.

Indeed, a certain naivete about science, if not politics, pervaded much of the debate over NSF's authorization in the Senate this summer. While the lawmakers seemed to breeze through the major spending proposals — and reductions — with little effort, they agonized over such items as the human-rights amendment that Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kansas) wanted attached to the bill.

The latter-day human-rights advocate said he wanted to bar the use of NSF funds to support the travel of US scientists abroad, unless the director of the Foundation had determined that the host countries had not denied anyone the opportunity to participate in the activity because of their "religious, ethical, cultural, or political views."

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) seemed to express the view of the chamber when he told his colleagues the arguments to support Dole's amendment were far from convinving.

"Why does not the Senator from Kansas say, 'Let's cut off the shipment of Kansas wheat to the Soviet Union?' Kennedy asked. "He talks about cutting back on scientific exchange, but when it comes to considering jobs in Kansas, and the billions of dollars worth of Kansas wheat and other agricultural products that go to the Soviet Union, he is silent.

"If you want to talk about something that will have an impact," Kennedy added, "let us talk about something else that will have one. Why talk about the 1,100 scientists who want to go to or from the Soviet Union? If you want to take a bite out of the apple, take it where it may have some impact."

With opposition to the bill coming from nearly every quarter — including Frank Press, the White House science adviser — Senator Dole could hardly have expected his amendment to pass, but the Senator from Kansas continued to push his arguments until his fellow Republicans managed to shut him up.

"Upon consideration," said Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY), "I realize exactly what my colleagues have argued, that it would be counterproductive; that we would cut off our own scientists from contact with another great reservoir of scientific activity; that we would tend to isolate more the scientists in the Soviet Union, and that

(Continued on Page 3)

Agriculture Research Survives

The Department of Agriculture's debut into competitive, peer-reviewed research has survived a throttling attempt in Congress, but, if a House-Senate conference verdict holds up, the sum available for the new fiscal year will be the same as last year — $15 million, rather than the $30 million sought by the Administration.

Meanwhile, the deployment of this year's money is well underway, following the award of 64 grants in recent weeks.

Designed to wean Agriculture from its traditional method of funding research on a block basis — which means you get money just because you got it last time — the competitive program annually provides $10 million for the basic plant sciences and $5 million for human nutrition research. Since competition and peer review are incompatible with the maintenance of drowsiness in agricultural research, friends of the status quo induced the House to wipe out the Administration's request to continue the program (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 14). But in conference, the Senate prevailed, at least to the extent of keeping the program alive. Another hundred or so grants are scheduled to be announced soon, according to a Department of Agriculture announcement.

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Pamela Moore

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $84.50 (two years, $149.50); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015.

OTA Produces a List of the Big Problems

The news from the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) is that it has been given a last-minute turndown by a high-level recruit, and it has also developed a near-cosmic 32-item "priority list" of problems that it wants to study in its role as Congress's think-tank.

The dropout recruit is Raymond Bowers, a professor of physics who heads Cornell University's Program in Science, Technology and Society. Bowers, who once worked for the White House science office, had agreed to take OTA's newly created post of assistant director and chief scientist, starting in a few weeks. But just a few days after OTA Director Russell W. Peterson announced the appointment, Bowers informed him that, because of "personal and domestic reasons," he had changed his mind.

Bowers emphasized that his decision does not stem from any lack of regard for OTA, which, by many indications, is coming along well under the rejuvenating hand of Peterson, who took the directorship in January.

Having requested and received authority to run OTA's internal affairs without interference from the agency's board of Congressional overseers, Peterson has reshuffled the staff and now has, in effect, received authority for OTA to hold the initiative in deciding what subjects are important for its Congressional clients.

That's always been a touchy matter, and, in fact, it created a good deal of difficulty for OTA's founding director, Emilio Q. Daddario, who never satisfactorily settled the problem of an order of priorities for OTA's services. The agency's charter specifies that assessments may be initiated by Congress's committees, by OTA's Congressional Board, and by the Director, in consultation with the Board. The effect, of course, was to make OTA vulnerable to any member seeking scholarly con-

(Continued on Page 4)

BUDGET

(Continued From Page 2)

if there is going to be some new enlightenment in terms of human rights in the Soviet Union, the tremendous agents of that enlightenment will be these very people whom we would be cutting off."

Apart from their attempts to win political points, some legislators did express serious concern about the way NSF has spent some of its money in recent years.

In their conference report on the NSF appropriation bill, for example, the House-Senate negotiators told the Foundation that it could not award research grants in which any investigator was paid more than the maximum salary received at the federal GS-18 level — currently $47,500 a year. The only exception to that rule, the conferees said, would be when the Director of the Foundation "expressly approved" it, and then the Director would be required to inform both the House and Senate appropriations committees of his decision.

The concern over salaries stems in part from an unhappy experience that Sen. Henry Bellmon (R-Oklahoma) had several years ago when he tried to persuade a university scientist to join his staff. Even with the offer of a generous Congressional salary, a staff aide to the Senator said, he was unable to come close to matching the scientist's earnings from government-supported research.

In other areas, the conferees voted to provide $80 million for NSF-sponsored science education programs. The compromise figure was $2.6 million below that approved by the House, but $5 million above the amount requested by the President and approved by the Senate. Of the increase, the conferees stipulated in their report that $2.4 million should be applied "on a priority basis" to the following three programs only: undergraduate research participation, student-originated studies, and instructional scientific equipment.

Of the total budget appropriated for the Foundation, the conferees specified how much could be spent in only two other areas. For applied science and research applications, the conferees earmarked $55.5 million and for scientific activities overseas, the lawmakers said the Foundation could spent $4 million in the coming year.

What the lawmakers did not say which Science Foundation officials had hoped they would, was that NSF's authorization would be extended for two years. Although money for all federal agencies must be appropriated each year, few must actually be reauthorized each year. Critics of the current NSF system argue that it leaves too little time to look at the Nation's long-range basic research needs and to provide stable, consistent funding to meet those needs.

As with the other appropriations battles they have lost this year, NSF, the White House, and the mission agencies are already at work on the unending legislative process, hoping next year to push their proposals for more money and more stability for scientific research through Congress. Of course it's too soon to know if they will be successful, but as the president of the National Cattlemen's Association — an erstwhile lobbyist for agriculture research — put it: "With the way Proposition 13 fever has spread out here in Kansas, I don't think any time in the next few years it will be healthy for those legislators to start spending any more money than they have to." —Anne Roark

(The writer is an assistant editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education).*

. . . Peterson Says OTA Can Do it Better

(Continued From Page 3)

firmation of his preconceptions.

Peterson has responded to this problem by going out to any and all concerned with the interaction of technology and public policy and asking them to specify what they think are the most important problems. All in all, OTA sent out 4500 inquiries, and got back 1418 replies, from which it culled a list of 286 items. The final list (see box, this page) of 32 contains no surprises, and, it may be said without presumption, could have been compiled without straining the Postal Service with all that correspondence. But the list, which was swiftly endorsed by OTA's Board and Advisory Council at a meeting September 18, provides a barrier against nit-picking assessment requests from the halls of Congress. The barrier is not impenetrable, but with Peterson hoping to have OTA take up perhaps half of the list in the near future, it is easy to fend off assessment requests for still other topics.

Further, as Peterson made clear at a press briefing September 15, OTA will employ a process of asking to be asked to handle these topics; it is not going off on its own. Peterson noted that all of the items on the list dovetail with one or another Congressional committee jurisdiction, and he expressed confidence that these customers would find it interesting to have OTA produce assessments on topics that concern them.

The fact that many of the 32 priority items have not been the victims of neglect in the think-tank industry was described by Peterson as of no concern to him. And the reason is that, regardless of what's been produced in past inquiries, Peterson feels that OTA is uniquely positioned to probe these matters with degrees of objectivity and thoroughness that may not be available to other policy-research organizations. Obviously drawing on his experiences as Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, 1973-76, Peterson told the press briefing that studies sponsored by the Executive Branch are subject to various "influences," among which he cited the Office of Management and Budget and "campaign promises."

OTA, on the other hand, he said, works for 535 members of Congress, which means that no particular point of view can dominate its work; seeking only to provide illumination for its legislative clients, he said, OTA gains from being even-handed. The impression he left was of a home-team enthusiast, which may be what the reviving OTA requires at its helm at this point.

The 32-item priority list is surprising only to the extent that it contains a number of defense-related topics and omits the very subjects that poll after poll show as ranking uppermost in the concerns of the American people — inflation and crime.

THE OTA PRIORITY LIST

1. Alternative national energy futures
2. Alternative global food futures
3. National water supply and demand
4. Health promotion and disease prevention
5. The productivity of U.S. croplands, forests and wetlands
6. Regulations and technological innovation (health, environment, safety)
7. The impact of nuclear war
8. Impact of changing telecommunications policy
9. Technology and world population
10. The potential economic impacts of Federal R&D
11. Impacts of applied genetics
12. Cost effectiveness of medical technologies
13. Peace technology
14. Weather and climate technology
15. The movement of goods
16. The future of military equipment
17. Deep ocean minerals development
18. Technology and the developing world — meeting basic human needs
19. Technology and education
20. Designing for conservation of materials
21. Potential for advanced air transport
22. Technology and decentralization
23. Role of technology in meeting housing needs
24. The impact of microprocessing on society
25. Utilization of extraterrestrial space
26. Ocean waste disposal
27. Energy efficiency in industry
28. Controlled thermonuclear fusion
29. Prospects for increased longevity
30. Prescription drug use
31. Technology and mental health
32. Forest resource technologies

As for defense, OTA, pre-Peterson, stayed away from that lobby-ridden, highly contentious business, with the exception of a couple of quick and minor studies of no great import. The reason was that in its startup years, the Office considered it prudent to avoid such topics as the impact of nuclear war, arms control, and military procurement — lest the partisans on one side or the other get incensed at the agency.

Peterson, however, feels that OTA is now sufficiently well established to take on any topic within its mandate to assess technology for the Congress, no matter how prickly the politics of the topic might be. MIT President Jerome Wiesner, who heads OTA's Advisory Council,

(Continued on Page 5)

SGR Has a Long Talk with Frank Press

SGR's periodic chats with Washington's senior science-policy officials do not always produce items that lend themselves to the traditional news formula. Nonetheless, for enriching our understanding of what's going on, they are invaluable, and on the assumption that readers might also benefit from a look-in on some of the diverse and diffuse matters that come up in these conversations, we offer, in a spirit of journalistic sharing, notes and observations derived from one such recent talk.

●

We had a talk the other day with Frank Press, the White House science adviser, who, upon being invited to discuss what was officially on his mind, started talking about the basic research programs of the Department of Energy. A recent study, chaired by S.J. Buchsbaum, of Bell Labs, had concluded that DOE was neglecting basic research (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 12), and Press, for whom the study was prepared, agreed with the findings, and said that he had been trying to do something to correct the situation. He had held a meeting, he reported, with DOE's assistant secretaries and said that he had obtained general agreement that the agency was too oriented to the short-term and wasn't thinking in terms of research programs that would fill needs that would develop over the next decade or two.

Press said that he listed a number of "top research groups" in the country, and pointed out to the DOE brass that their agency wasn't involved with any of them.

Press conceded, in our talk, that it's difficult to move so ponderous an agency as the DOE, but always optimistic, even after 18 months in the White House, he said he was confident that DOE would do something serious about the problem.

He was also in an upbeat mood about the so-called Fukuda initiative, which refers to Japanese Premier Fukuda's suggestion that the US and Japan collaborate on big research projects (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 15). A US delegation visited Tokyo last month for preliminary discussions, and Press said that, here, too, he was optimistic about the outcome. The programs that have been discussed, he said, are quite different from the col-

(Continued on Page 6)

OTA *(Continued From Page 4)*

had a warning to issue on that subject, however: that defense-related subjects are so plentiful and complex that, unless restraint is exercised, OTA could easily find itself overwhelmed with the task of probing such matters. Wiesner noted that such was his experience when he headed the White House science office in the Kennedy Administration.

As for the omission of inflation, Peterson explained that consideration was given to that topic but it was felt that it would duplicate a massive study being conducted under the direction of the Joint Economic Committee. Technology and crime control, he said, evoked little interest among the thousands whose opinions were sought in making up the list. Peterson said that doesn't mean that the subject might not be taken on, but that since the list runneth over — in terms of OTA's resources — he and his staff didn't feel it was important to add that particular item.

Finally, Peterson stated that OTA will continue to depend heavily on outside groups of specialists to assist with its studies. But he stressed that OTA regards itself as manager and "integrator" of the studies it undertakes, and while outsiders will have an important part in the process, OTA itself will monitor and assemble the final product.

OTA Assessments In Progress, October 1978 With Target Date for Completion

1. Siting of Coastal Energy Facilities, November 1978
2. Oil Shale Technology, November 1978
3. Conservation through Reduced Wastage, November 1978
4. Coal Utilization, January 1979
5. Residential/Commercial Energy Conservation, January 1979
6. Impacts of Global Trends in Energy Supply, Demand and Technology, January 1979
7. Alternative Pest Management Strategies, March 1979
8. Existing Federal Coal Development Rights, April 1979
9. Energy from Biological Processes, April 1979
10. Societal Effects of National Information Systems, April 1979
11. Impact of Technology on U.S. Industry Competitiveness, April 1979
12. Implications of International Technology Transfer, May 1979
13. Environmental Contaminants in Food, May 1979
14. Technology for Local Development, September 1979
15. The Future Use and Characteristics of the Automobile Transportation System, September 1979
16. Future Availability of Imported Materials, September 1979
17. Disposal of Nuclear Wastes, October 1979

. . . Press Worried About Academic Science

(Continued From Page 5)

laborative efforts that the US has with many other nations. "What we're talking about," Press said, "are big, high-technology projects, in the $100 million range and above, such as fusion and coal research." So far, he added, only the principles have been agreed to; details will be worked out shortly when a Japanese delegation visits Washington.

As for our booming relationship with the People's Republic of China, Press said that preparations are going ahead to receive what may ultimately be thousands of Chinese students. Asked whether the Chinese have shown any concern about the impact that American campus life might have on their youngsters, Press said, "The people on our side keep bringing that up, but the Chinese say they're not worried.

"When we warned them that there might be a problem of culture shock, one of them replied, 'If we lose a few, so what?'"

Since the recent US embrace of China has been interpreted as a slap at the Soviets in retaliation for their prosecution and imprisonment of several prominent dissidents, Press was asked whether there was any concern about human rights problems in China.

"That's something that we're concerned about," he replied, "but you first have to have a relationship in order to have any influence." He conceded, however, that we know next to nothing about the Chinese human rights situation, and passed on to other topics.

The President and the Office of Management and Budget, he said, require no prodding on the importance of federal support for science. "They believe in basic research," he said. "They see that industry is phasing out [in support of basic science] and they intuitively accept that basic research is valuable for the country and that there is a federal obligation to support it."

Looking back on the fiscal year that just ended, 1978, Press said that it appears that basic research emerged from the Congressional appropriations process with perhaps two per cent in real growth, compared to the approximately five per cent that the President had sought. The falloff, Press said, is attributable to a good deal more inflation than was anticipated, as well as an assortment of Congressional cuts.

But, he pointed out, it's incorrect to apply conventional inflation yardsticks to science. "Science," he said, "has a higher inflation than the rest of the country, simply because equipment keeps getting more and more sophisticated and more expensive. Our big problem is that the equipment is getting obsolete."

Press then expressed his concerns about what's happening in what he referred to as "the sociology of science," which he said is being pushed by forces whose effects might not be visible for a decade.

Specifically, he said, he was concerned about the tenure jam in academe and the job shortage it is creating for newly graduated Ph.D.s.

"Things are happening in the universities that really aren't understood," he said. Among them, he said, are "gray-area" staff, doctoral degree holders who are outside the tenure system as contract employees. "We just don't know what effect this status has on their careers and their potential and performance as scientists." He added that with undergraduate enrollments facing a decline, teaching assistantships, traditionally an important source of support for graduate students, would also decline. But with what effect on the longterm future of science, we don't know, he said.

Asked why his office, which is not hesitant to undertake formal studies on a large assortment of science-related matters, hadn't set up one on this subject, Press said he didn't think the problem could be successfully examined. SGR responded with puzzlement over this conclusion, but Press insisted that the matter was far more complex than we seemed to realize.

Turning to a number of other topics, Press said that he was pleased to note that engineering enrollments were soaring, apparently in response to much-improved job opportunities for engineers. But, he added, the job market is so favorable for first-degree holders that it appears that many are passing up an opportunity for advanced degrees. How this would affect engineering in the long run, he said, is unclear, but he indicated that here, too, was another development whose long-term effects were worrisome. Press repeatedly stressed that the academic segment of the R&D enterprise is undergoing far more turbulence than is generally recognized.

(Continued on Page 7)

AIP—German Info Pact

The American Institute of Physics and the West German National Information Center for Energy, Physics, Mathematics have entered into an agreement to collaborate on an abstracting service that will provide worldwide coverage of physics research.

According to an AIP announcement, the German organization will provide English-language abstracts of journal articles and reports assembled from its own sources, will combine them with AIP abstracts, and will produce magnetic tapes and a printed journal of abstracts.

(For additional information: Audrey Likely, Public Relations Division, American Institute of Physics, 335 East 45th St., New York, N.Y. 10017; Tel: 212 661-9404).

Child Health Institute Establishes Nutrition Program

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has established a Program in Clinical Nutrition and Early Development "to support research on how behavioral, genetic and social factors affect diet and nutrition."

The program will be administered in the office of Institute Director Norman Kretchmer. For additional information: Director, National Institute of Child Health and Development, Room 2A-03, Building 31, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. Tel. (202) 496-3454.

Teague Symposium Cancelled

The National Science Policy Symposium, scheduled for Sept. 16 at Texas A&M University in honor of Rep. Olin Teague (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 14), was cancelled because of the Congressman's illness. An announcement from the university said that it is hoped "that suitable science-related tribute to the Congressman can be held at a later date." Teague, chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, is retiring from Congress at the end of this session.

PRESS *(Continued From Page 6)*

"Some great science departments have deteriorated. There's no doubt about that," he said, naming a couple of departments, and then invoking our understanding that he held the right in our talk to go off the record. "It's better not to identify them," he said.

In regard to industrial research, which is included in a massive study of industrial innovation now underway — headed by the Commerce Department, with strong participation from Press's office — Press observed that "Germany and Japan do very well in using government as a patron of research. In Germany, some areas of industrial research receive as much as 50 to 90 per cent of their costs from the government. And Japan is spending $300 million on government micro-electronics projects."

The innovation study, he said, would produce options, for presidential consideration, on how the US might strengthen its industrial R&D situation.

Our industrial-academic links, he said, are now mainly in the form of academic consulting for industry. But that may not be sufficient, he said, noting with interest that several American corporations have taken special steps to strengthen their academic ties. Monsanto, which has provided $20 million for research at Harvard, is one such case, he said. And, he continued, one function of General Motors' Science Advisory Board is to strengthen the ties between GM and academic science. —DSG

Senate Science Committee Issues Flock of Publications

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation has announced the availability of the following hearings:

NASA Authorization for Fiscal year 1979, parts 1, 2, and 3, February 21, 22, and 28, March 1, 7, 8 and 16, Serial No. 95-86 (Part 4, Index, to be printed at a later date).

Oversight of Science and Technology Policy, Parts 1 and 2, February 10, 14, and April 26, 1978, Serial No. 95-77.

Export Policy, Joint hearing between Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs and Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, Part 7, Oversight on U.S. High Technology Exports, May 16, 1978.

Committee Print — Recombinant DNA Research and its Applications, Oversight report, together with minority views, August 1978.

Authorization of the Standard Reference Data Act and Review of the National Bureau of Standards, February 15 and April 6, 1978, Serial No. 95-72.

Nuclear Waste Disposal and Utilization, March 31, 1978, Serial No. 95-92.

A limited supply of these hearings is available, and requests will be filled in the order received. To order, send a self-addressed mailing label to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space, Room 5202, Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510.

News Notes: New Appointments, Publications

James D. Palmer, former president of Metropolitan State College, Denver, has taken office as head of the Department of Transportation's new Research and Special Programs Administration. A former professor of electrical engineering, Palmer will head a staff of 900, with responsibilities for programs in hazardous materials shipments, pipeline safety, transportation security and universtiy research.

●

There's a new journal of abstracts in the nutrition field, *Nutrition Planning,* a quarterly published by the Community Systems Foundation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, with the assistance of the Agency for International Development. Charter subscriptions are available for $22.50 ($27.50 airmail). Address: *Nutrition Planning,* PO Box 8080, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107.

●

Ronald C. Davidson, assistant director for applied plasma physics at the Department of Energy, has been appointed director of the MIT Plasma Fusion Center. He succeeds Lawrence Lidsky, who has held the post on an acting basis since last May, when Albert G. Hill retired after directing development of the Center.

Anthony Robbins, executive director of the Colorado Department of Health, has been appointed director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

●

Don E. Kash, professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma and a widely published authority on science-policy issues, has been appointed assistant director for regulations at the US Geological Survey.

●

Some 12,000 pages of recently declassified CIA political and economic studies of Communist-bloc countries are available on microfiche from UPDATA Publications, 1756 Westwood Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. For information, call UPDATA collect: (213) 474-5900.

●

Mark Hegsted, professor of nutrition at Harvard, has been appointed director of the newly established Human Nutrition Center in the Department of Agriculture.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

3